

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, dated March 12, 2003, the Examiner states that Claims 1 and 2 are pending and Claims 1 and 2 are rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the specification, the claims, and the drawings.

In the Office Action, drawing FIG. 5 is objected to for not being labeled as "Prior Art" and for including reference numeral 55b which is not defined in the specification. Applicant herewith submits a replacement drawing sheet on which FIG. 5 has been amended to be labeled as "Prior Art" and to remove reference numeral 55b. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the title is objected to for being not descriptive. The Applicant amends the title as --SHADOW MASK FOR A CATHODE RAY TUBE-- to overcome the objection.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Ohtake et al. (US 5,830,373). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection.

Independent Claim 1 includes the feature that "each of said through holes has a ridge portion formed by intersection of a taper surface of said rear side hole portion and a taper surface of said front side hole portion. However, nowhere in US 5,830,373 is there any disclosure of such a feature.

The rejection states that Ohtake et al. discloses "Each through hole has a ridge portion formed by the intersection of the taper surface of the rear side hole portion and a taper surface of the front side hole portion", without any direction to where in the reference this is disclosed. In fact, nowhere is there disclosed a tapered surface of the rear side hole portion which could possibly form a ridge portion with the tapered surface of the front side hole portion.

In order for a prima facie case of anticipation to be made under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), each and every feature of the rejected claim must be taught by a single prior art reference. Since the feature of the claimed ridge portion is not taught by US 5,830,373, a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established. The Applicant therefore considers the rejection overcome and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

---

The Applicant has amended Claim 1 to clarify that the rear side hole portion has an inwardly tapered surface. However, this amendment was made merely to clarify the claim and not for any reasons related to patentability.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in better condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

September 10, 2003  
Date

  
Attorney for Applicant  
Brian W. Hameder  
c/o Ladas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300  
Reg. No. 45613